

just steamrolled it and apparently, when the election results come in, everybody believes widely there will be one very clear winner, not anybody really in second place. I do not know if that will be true. I think that is a feeling that probably kept people from voting.

In any event, when you have a countrywide presidential election that is supposed to be the most historic event in the peaceful turnover of democracy in the whole history of the country's 200 years and you only get somewhere between 20 and 30 percent turnout, clearly it is not working quite the way it should be.

Security was better. Law and order was better. Of course, it would be if you have Humvees with machine guns and soldiers mounted all over the place and running around from place to place insuring nothing gets out of hand. So we have somewhat of an artificial situation there about law and order.

Regrettably, as in every election, we had intimidations that kept candidates out. We had the media shut down through intimidations. We had allegations of misuse of dollars, all of those kinds of things. These things need a full accounting and full investigation.

Then the President needs to come to Congress and consult and tell Congress and the American people how we spent our money, what we have got for it, and where we are going next. I urge the President, Mr. Speaker, very much this time to consult with Congress before we get into the next chapter of what our relations are going to be with Haiti. I would hate to have to debate another invasion here, because we are seeing one more time a flood of refugees coming to the United States, and the administration's reaction is to send the military.

The economy does not work in Haiti. We know that. We need to have a full accounting. We need to know where we are going, and I urge the administration to check with the U.S. Congress. We are here to help.

NO BUDGET, NO PAY FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, last month the Federal Government was shut down by the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. DOLE for the longest period of time in our Nation's history. It cost American taxpayers \$100 million a day for this political strategy, a manufactured crisis that sent 800,000 Federal employees home.

Most people thought that the Republicans had learned their lesson. America was not ready for that kind of political strategy. They found it childish and unnecessary, and yet here we are today in the midst of another Govern-

ment shutdown, inspired and orchestrated by the same Republican leaders. They just do not get it. They do not understand that sending home some 300,000 Federal employees a few days before Christmas is beyond heartless, it is stupid, crazy for us as a Nation to be incurring debts of \$80 million to \$100 million a day because of someone's pride.

The American people sent Democrats and Republicans to Washington to solve problems, not to create them, not to say to people who are going to Federal agencies today that their phone calls will be unanswered and no one will be at the door. What they want us to do is to sit down in a commonsense, bipartisan way, deal with our budgetary problems, to make sure we protect Medicare and Medicaid, to make sure that we do not end up obliterating college student loan programs, and to bring a balanced budget in a reasonable period of time.

It is time for some of the political hubris to be set aside.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I think the gentleman makes an excellent point. I mean, I think the American people know there are differences between us. We believe in saving the Medicare and Medicaid systems, with some moderate cuts. They believe in huge cuts and then tax cuts.

Mr. DURBIN. Let me just close by saying this: If it is a matter of principle to shut down the Government, as a matter of principle, the Speaker ought to give up his paycheck; no budget, no pay. If it applies to Federal employees, it ought to apply to the Speaker and every Member of Congress.

THE BUDGET IMPASSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I have a different view of why we have reached this impasse today. I acknowledge that in the past, during the discussions about reaching a balanced budget, that both sides bear some responsibility for putting some unnecessary obstacles in the way of reaching that goal. I think that the Republicans, at the very beginning, tried to put in unnecessary non-budget-related issues that have since been removed.

I think the President tried to avoid agreeing to a 7-year timeframe even though when he was campaigning for President of the United States 3 years ago, he said he would propose a balanced budget in 5 years.

But even though the past responsibility falls on both political parties, I believe the current impasse we are in today falls squarely on the Clinton ad-

ministration, and that is simply because the President of the United States is attempting to back out of the agreement he entered into less than a month ago with the Congress of the United States. We resolved the last partial Government shutdown by coming to an agreement. There were several major terms in that agreement, and one of those terms was that we would use common economic projections to put together a balanced budget.

I know this sounds very technical, but economic projections are the building blocks of any budget. They are the forecasts, in this case over 7 years, of how much Government revenue will be received, how much there will be an inflationary impact on Government programs and so forth.

The agreement by the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States was that we would use the figures of the Congressional Budget Office. Now, there was an additional provision, that the Congressional Budget Office was expected to consult with outside sources, which, to the best of my knowledge, they have done. But the bottom line, without any doubt, is that a budget would be put together using only the economic projections of the Congressional Budget Office. The President of the United States now is attempting to avoid living up to an agreement with the Congress of the United States, and the President has stated, first of all, that the Congress is demanding that the President put some cuts in Medicare and Medicaid and other programs up before negotiations can continue. This is not correct.

The Congress is saying the President should put forward a budget based upon CBO, Congressional Budget Office, projections, and that is all. Within those budget projections, the President is free, the administration is free, to put together any budget they want. They can have tax cuts or not have tax cuts. They can have tax increases if they want to propose it. They can have more funding for any program, less funding for any other program. So there is absolutely nothing in putting together a budget based upon the Congressional Budget Office economic projections of revenue, inflation and so forth, that dictates in advance what a budget has to look like.

I heard one of my Democratic colleagues this morning on television say, "Well, the agreement was we will use the Congressional Budget Office as a baseline, but then we could look at other figures." That is not correct. The agreement was that we would use the Congressional Budget Office figures.

Now, the point is, Mr. Speaker, that that is exactly what the Congress of the United States has done. The Congress of the United States passed a budget. I do not agree with all of its individual terms. But the Congress of the United States passed a budget and sent to the President a budget that was balanced in 7 years, which was part of our